



TITLE:

Do cats (*Felis catus*) predict the presence of an invisible object from sound?

AUTHOR(S):

Takagi, Saho; Chijiwa, Hitomi; Arahori, Minori;
Tsuzuki, Mana; Hyuga, Ayami; Fujita, Kazuo

CITATION:

Takagi, Saho ...[et al]. Do cats (*Felis catus*) predict the presence of an invisible object from sound?. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research* 2015, 10(5): 407-412

ISSUE DATE:

2015-09

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/202114>

RIGHT:

© 2015. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>; The full-text file will be made open to the public on 17 July 2016 in accordance with publisher's 'Terms; This is not the published version. Please cite only the published version. この論文は出版社版ではありません。引用の際には出版社版をご確認ご利用ください。 and Conditions for Self-Archiving'.

1 Do cats (*Felis catus*) predict the presence of an invisible
2 object from sound?

3

4 Saho Takagi

5 Hitomi Chijiiwa

6 Minori Arahori

7 Mana Tsuzuki

8 Ayami Hyuga

9 Kazuo Fujita

10

11 **Affiliation:** *Department of Psychology, Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University,*

12 *Yoshida-honmachi, Sakyo, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan.*

13 **Corresponding author:** Saho Takagi, sahonekosan@yahoo.co.jp

14 **Telephone/Fax:** +81 757532759

15

16 **Abstract**

17 Recognizing invisible entities from auditory information is advantageous to animals in various
18 situations including predator avoidance and foraging. In two experiments we asked whether cats
19 could predict the presence of an unseen object upon hearing noise it made, based on a
20 causal-logical rule. After observing an experimenter shaking an opaque container for 15 s
21 (observation phase), the cats freely explored the environment for 15 s (response phase).
22 Experiment 1 tested 3 conditions. In the first, “Contingent noise” condition, the object inside the
23 container made a rattling noise when shaken. In the second, “Irrelevant noise” condition, white
24 noise accompanied the shaking action. In the third, “No noise” condition, the shaking action
25 was silent. Experiment 2 tested a “Non-contingent noise” condition, in which the rattling noise
26 and movement of the container were out of synchrony. In both experiments cats looked at the
27 container for longer in the Contingent noise condition than the other conditions. These results
28 suggest that cats used a causal-logical understanding of auditory stimuli to predict the presence
29 of invisible objects. This ability may be related to the ecology of cats’ natural hunting style.

30 **Key words:** Domestic cats; Cognition; Causal-logical understanding; Sound; Ecological
31 background

32

33 Introduction

34 Information obtained via the sensory organs is often ambiguous or fragmentary. For
35 example, an animal hunting in the bush by sight might hear only the noise the prey makes. In
36 this case inferring the presence of a prey from the noise would be advantageous to the hunter's
37 survival. Similarly, potential prey may be more likely to survive if they can predict the presence
38 of predators from indirect clues such as odor and noise.

39 Inferential reasoning refers to the ability to use available information to draw conclusions
40 about circumstances that are not directly observable (Heimbauer et al., 2012). Call (2004)
41 explored this ability in great apes. He presented apes with two opaque cups, one of which they
42 knew to be baited. The apes were given visual or auditory cues about the contents of both cups
43 (full information) or only one of the cups (partial information) before making a choice. The
44 subjects were able to see the contents of the cups in a visual domain test, and to hear a rattling
45 noise when the cup was shaken in an auditory domain test. The latter test required an
46 understanding of the causal-logical rule between the noise and movement of the containers. In
47 contrast to the full visual information task on which all apes succeeded, fewer subjects passed
48 the auditory tests even with full information (16.6 % (2/12), 50 % (2/4), 0 % (0/6), 62.5 % (5/8)
49 of chimpanzees, bonobos, orangutans, and gorillas, respectively). Similar results have been
50 obtained in other nonhuman primate species: 0 % (0/8) in rhesus macaques (Petit al., 2015),

51 33 % (7/21) in olive baboons (Schmitt and Fischer, 2009; Petit et al., 2015), 50 % (2/4) in
52 lemurs (Maille and Roeder, 2012), and 30 % (8/26) in capuchin monkeys (Sabbatini and
53 Visalberghi, 2008; Paukner et al., 2009; Heimbauer et al., 2012), although 100 % (8/8) of
54 tonkean macaques succeeded in an auditory test (Petit et al., 2015). It appears surprising that
55 this causal relationship is so poorly understood by primates.

56 Several researchers have related this poverty of causal understanding to the ecological
57 importance of auditory information of each species (Maille and Roeder, 2012; Plotnik et al.,
58 2014). Nonhuman primates are generally poor at auditory as opposed to visual tasks (Schmitt
59 and Fischer, 2009). D’Amato and Salmon (1982) suggested that whereas cats use auditory
60 stimuli to locate prey, primates often use sounds as cues to avoid rather than approach the
61 source. Given that cats often use auditory cues when hunting (Turner and Meister, 1988),
62 investigating cats’ predictions about invisible objects from noise can contribute to understanding
63 how ecological factors influence functional differences among sensory modalities.

64 It has been suggested that cats’ causal-logical understanding in the physical domain is not
65 sophisticated (Bradshaw, 2013). Whitt et al (2009) tested domestic cats on string-pulling tasks
66 to explore their understanding of physical causality. After the cats were initially trained to pull a
67 string to obtain a food reward, three tests were conducted. In “longer string” tests, cats were
68 rewarded for choosing a baited string that was longer than the one used in training. In “parallel”

69 and “crossed strings” tests, cats were required to choose between two strings, only one of which
70 was baited. The cats failed to choose the baited string in both tests; no causal understanding was
71 demonstrated. Bradshaw (2013) pointed out that string-pulling tasks lack ecological validity and
72 that they may not be an appropriate test of cats’ physical understanding. It may be advantageous
73 to test cats’ causal understanding using a different modality. We propose that the auditory
74 modality may be more suitable.

75 Here we present two experiments that investigated whether cats could show causal-logical
76 understanding about the existence of an object inside an opaque container when they observe
77 the container being moved accompanied by a rattling sound. We tested cats in 3 conditions in
78 each of the 2 experiments. In Experiment 1, we ran “Contingent noise,” “Irrelevant noise,” and
79 “No noise” conditions. The experimenter shook the container repeatedly while the cats watched.
80 In Contingent noise condition, a block of wood inside the container made a rattling noise as it
81 moved. In Irrelevant noise condition, white noise was played during the movement of the
82 container. In No noise condition, the experimenter shook the empty container. In Experiment 2,
83 “Non-contingent noise” condition replaced “Irrelevant noise” condition. In this new condition,
84 the rattling noise was not synchronized with the motion of the container. We hypothesized that if
85 cats form a representation of an invisible object from auditory stimuli, they would pay more
86 attention to the Contingent noise condition than to any other conditions.

87

88 **Experiment 1**89 **Materials and Method**90 *Subjects*

91 Thirty-eight domestic cats (24 males and 14 females) participated in Experiment 1.
92 Seventeen were kept at cat cafés¹ and 21 were house pets. Eleven cats were pure breeds and 27
93 were mixed breeds. Their mean age was 3.1 years (range: 2-156 mo). Details of the subjects are
94 shown in Table S1. The cats were not deprived of food or water during the tests.

95 *Apparatus and stimuli*

96 We put a wooden block (5 cm × 4 cm) or a Bluetooth-driven wireless speaker (4 cm × 5
97 cm Princeton PSP-BTS1) into an opaque cylindrical container (15 cm in diameter × 12 cm
98 high) made of cardboard. The block moved freely but the speaker was fixed in the container so
99 as not to make any noise during shaking. The speaker played white noise in Irrelevant noise
100 condition. A mobile phone (Xperia A3) with Bluetooth compatibility was used to control the
101 sound stimulus. The rattling sound and white noise were around 78 dB at 1 m as measured by a

¹ A Cat café is a tea room in which customers enjoy making contact and playing
with cats kept as “hosts” in Japan.

102 precision sound level meter (NL-52, RION CO., LTD). The test was recorded by two video
103 cameras (JVC GZ-E565-R, SONY HDR-CX390) placed so that they focused on the cats.

104 *Procedure*

105 The cats were individually tested in the owners' house or in cat cafés where the subjects live.
106 Tests started after the cats appeared to have habituated to the general situation. Either the owner
107 or experimenter 2 lightly restrained the cat on the floor, while experimenter 1 sat about 1 m
108 from the cat. The owner was unaware of the purpose or prediction of the study and was
109 instructed not to influence the cat's behavior during the experiment. There were 2 phases: the
110 observation phase and the response phase. Experimenter 1 called the subject's name to attract its
111 attention. After this, experimenter 1 shook the opaque box for 15 s (observation phase). The
112 experimenter then put the container on the floor and said: "Please release the cat". The subject
113 was allowed to freely explore the environment for 15 s (response phase), during which
114 experimenters looked down.

115 There were 3 conditions. In "Contingent noise" condition, the wooden block was put into
116 the container so that shaking resulted in a rattling sounds contingent upon its motion. In
117 "Irrelevant noise" condition, a speaker attached to the inside of the container produced white
118 noise when the container was shaken. In "No noise" condition, the container was empty and
119 shaking it produced no noise (see Figure 1). All subjects participated in all 3 conditions, one

trial for each. The interval between trials was at least 3 minutes, with the order of conditions randomized for each subject. Five to six cats were assigned to six sequences, respectively.

Analysis

The videos of the observation and response phases were analyzed using Adobe Premiere CS6 at a rate of 30 frames per second. Because the duration of the observation phase varied across subjects and trials, we analyzed the minimum number of frames in the three conditions for each subject. Thus the number of coded frames was the same for each subject but varied among subjects. For the response phase, we analyzed the initial 450 frames (15 s).

A coder recorded each subject's attention to the container in each phase, calculating the proportion of total frames in which looking occurred. The occurrence of search behavior was scored as 0 (absent) or 1 (present) in each condition for each subject. We defined search behavior as bringing the nose into contact with the container.

To check reliability of coding, a second coder scored a random sample of 25 % of the videos. The correlation between the two coders' scoring of looking time was highly significant (Pearson's $r = 0.90$, $n = 24$, $p < .01$), and the corresponding correlation for search behavior was perfect (Pearson's $r = 1$, $n = 24$, $p < .01$).

Looking times were analyzed by one-way repeated-measures ANOVA with condition as the sole factor, and with the Huynh-Feldt correction for the violation of sphericity. We used

multiple comparisons with Modified Sequentially Rejective Bonferroni Procedure. The number of search behaviors for each conditions were subjected to binomial tests. All statistical analyses were run in R (ver. 3.0.0).

Results

Of the 38 cats tested, seven were excluded from the analyses: four due to video error and three due to distraction by extraneous noise. Thus, data from 31 cats were entered into analysis.

The proportion of frames in which looking at the container occurred during the observation phase is shown in Figure 2 (a). One-way repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition ($F(2, 30) = 7.00, p < 0.01$). A post-hoc comparison revealed that cats looked significantly longer in Contingent noise condition than No noise condition ($t(30) = 3.10, p = 0.01$), and longer in Irrelevant noise condition than No noise condition ($t(30) = 3.16, p = 0.01$). There was no significant difference between Contingent noise and Irrelevant noise conditions ($t(30) = 0.54, p = 0.58$).

Regarding looking during the response phase (Figure 2 (b)), no significant main effect of condition was found ($F(2, 30) = 1.09, p = .34$).

Total proportions of looking time are shown in Figure 2 (c). There was a significant main effect of condition ($F(2, 30) = 4.14, p = 0.02$). A post-hoc multiple comparison revealed that

156 cats looked significantly longer in Contingent noise condition than No noise condition ($t(30) =$
157 2.55, $p = 0.04$). A marginally significant difference was found between Irrelevant noise
158 condition and No noise condition ($t(30) = 1.20$, $p = 0.07$). There was no significant difference
159 between Contingent noise and Irrelevant noise condition ($t(30) = 1.86$, $p = 0.23$).

160 The effect of the order of test was nowhere found; there was no significant difference in
161 total looking time ($F(2, 30) = 1.75$, $p = 0.18$), that in observation phase ($F(2, 30) = 1.72$, $p =$
162 0.18) and that in response phase ($F(2, 30) = 1.35$, $p = 0.26$) among trial orders.

163 Search behavior was observed in 7 cats in Contingent noise condition, 6 in Irrelevant noise
164 condition, and 8 in No noise condition; there were no significant differences in Contingent noise,
165 Irrelevant noise and No noise conditions (binomial tests, $p = 1$, $p = 0.81$, $p = 0.64$, respectively).

166

167 Discussion

168 In Experiment 1, we asked whether cats predicted that an unseen object was inside the
169 container based on the relation between sound and movement. We found that cats looked longer
170 at the container during the observation phase in Contingent noise and Irrelevant noise conditions
171 than in No noise conditions. This difference was unchanged if we summed looking time in
172 observation and response phases. These results suggest that cats were simply attracted by noise
173 rather than the contingency between motion and noise.

174 However, the observation that looking time was longest in Contingent noise condition in
175 both analyses, albeit not significant, may imply that cats predicted the presence of an object
176 inside the container. The possibility remains that attraction by white noise overshadowed any
177 effect of contingency between noise and motion. To test this possibility, congruency between
178 motion and noise was manipulated in Experiment 2.

179

180 **Experiment 2**

181 **Materials and Method**

182 *Subjects*

183 Thirty-two cats (18 males and 14 females) participated in Experiment 2. Fifteen were kept at
184 cat cafés and 17 were house pets. Six were pure breeds and 26 were mixed breeds. Their mean
185 age was 3.4 years (range: 2-156 mo). Details of the subjects are shown in Table S2. Thirteen of
186 the subjects also participated in Experiment 1. The interval between Experiment 1 and
187 Experiment 2 was at least 2 months. The cats were never food or water deprived during the test.

188 *Apparatus and stimuli*

189 The apparatus was the same as that used in Experiment 1. We made a video recording of the
190 rattling noise of Contingent noise condition (camera: JVC GZ-E565-R, SONY HDR-CX390),
191 and made a 15-s. auditory stimulus using a video editor (CyberLink Power director ver. 11).

192 *Procedure*

193 The procedure was almost the same as in Experiment 1 except that the Irrelevant noise
194 condition was replaced by Non-contingent noise condition. There were 3 conditions. In
195 “Contingent noise” condition the movement of shaking container was synchronized with the
196 rattling sound played by the wireless speaker inside the container. In “Non-contingent noise”
197 condition the shaking movement and the rattling noise were not synchronized. The container
198 was shaken randomly with the same magnitude as in Contingent noise condition. “No noise”
199 condition was exactly the same as in Experiment 1: the container in the same way as in
200 Contingent noise condition (see Figure 1). As in Experiment 1, all subjects were tested in all
201 three conditions in an order chosen randomly from 6 possible sequences.

202 *Analysis*

203 Analyses were the same as in Experiment 1. The correlation between looking times coded
204 by two independent coders was satisfactory. The correlation between the two coders’ scoring of
205 looking time was highly significant (Pearson’s $r = 0.905$, $n = 18$, $p < .01$), and the correlation
206 between coders for search behavior was perfect (Pearson’s $r = 1$, $n = 18$, $p < .01$).

207

208 **Results**

209 Of the 32 cats tested, eight were excluded from the analyses due to distraction by extraneous

210 noise (5 cats) or failure to complete all 3 conditions (3 cats). Thus, data for 24 cats were
211 analyzed.

212 The proportions of frames in which looking at the container occurred during the
213 observation phase are shown in Figure 3 (a). One-way repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a
214 significant main effect of condition ($F(2, 23) = 4.07, p = 0.02$). A post-hoc multiple comparison
215 revealed that cats looked at the container significantly longer in Contingent noise condition than
216 both Non-contingent noise ($t(23) = 2.76, p = 0.01$) and No noise conditions ($t(23) = 2.13, p =$
217 0.04). There was no significant difference between Non-contingent noise and No noise
218 conditions ($t(23) = 0.57, p = 0.56$).

219 Looking scores during the response phase are shown in Figure 3 (b). As the sphericity
220 assumption was violated, degrees of freedom were adjusted by the Huynh-Feldt correction. There
221 was a significant main effect of condition ($F(1.4, 23) = 10.97, p < 0.01$). A post-hoc multiple
222 comparison revealed that cats looked at the container significantly longer in Contingent noise
223 condition than both Non-contingent noise ($t(23) = 3.11, p < 0.01$) and No noise conditions (t
224 $(23) = 3.64, p < 0.01$). There was also a significant difference between Non-contingent noise
225 and No noise conditions ($t(23) = 2.17, p = 0.04$).

226 Total looking proportions are shown in Figure 3 (c). There was a significant main effect of
227 condition ($F(2, 23) = 10.22, p < 0.01$). A post-hoc multiple comparison revealed that cats

228 looked at the container significantly longer in Contingent noise condition than both
229 Non-contingent noise ($t(23) = 3.84, p = 0.02$) and No noise conditions ($t(23) = 3.91, p < 0.01$).
230 No difference between Non-contingent noise and no noise conditions was found ($t(23) = .04, p$
231 $= 0.96$).

232 The effect of order was again nowhere found; there was no significant difference in total
233 looking time ($F(2, 23) = 0.28, p = 0.75$), in the observation phase ($F(2, 23) = 0.04, p = 0.95$),
234 or in the response phase ($F(2, 23) = 1.57, p = 0.21$).

235 Seven cats searched the container in Contingent noise condition, whereas 3 did so in each
236 of the Non-contingent noise and No noise conditions. There were no significant differences in
237 Contingent noise, Non-contingent noise and No noise conditions (binomial tests, $p = 0.14, p =$
238 $0.56, p = 0.56$, respectively).

239

240 Discussion

241 In Experiment 2, we used exactly the same sound in both Contingent noise and
242 Non-contingent noise conditions to test the possible effect of congruency between motion and
243 noise on cats' visual attention to the container. Cats looked longer in Contingent noise condition
244 during both observation and response phases. This differential behavior in the latter phase - after
245 the motion ceased - strongly suggests that cats were not simply attracted by the noise but

246 predicted that something was in the now-quiet and motionless container, after hearing noise
247 contingent upon motion. This implies that the cats formed a representation of an unseen object
248 when hearing its noise, according to a causal-logical rule.

249

250 **General Discussion**

251 This study investigated whether cats could represent the existence of an unseen object in an
252 opaque container from the rattling noise it made. We predicted that, if cats did so, they should
253 show more interest in the container if the noise and motion of the container are physically
254 congruent. Experiment 1 revealed that cats paid more attention to the container in Contingent
255 noise condition, in which noise matched the motion of the container, than in No noise condition.
256 However, the cats might simply have been attracted by the noise itself, regardless of the motion,
257 as shown by similar responses in Contingent noise and the Irrelevant noise condition in which
258 white noise replaced the rattling sound. To test this possibility, in Experiment 2 we replaced
259 white noise with a non-contingent rattling sound which was not synchronized with the motion
260 of the container. The cats clearly looked at the container for longer in Contingent noise
261 condition compared to the Non-contingent noise condition. These results suggest that cats
262 predict the presence of an invisible object from noise, applying a physical rule.

263 Might the cats have simply showed a visual preference for movement accompanied by a

264 synchronized noise? Human infants prefer objects accompanied with synchronized noise
265 (Spelke, 1979; Spelke et al., 1983; Bahrick, 1987), but the acquisition of causal-logical
266 understanding of the relation between noise and movement does not emerge until approximately
267 3 years of age (Hill et al., 2012). However, in the present study cats' preference persisted even
268 after the container was motionless after being placed on the floor. This behavior implies
269 representation of an invisible object rather than a simple multimodal combination of ongoing
270 motion and noise.

271 Several authors have commented on how ecology of a species may affect inferential
272 reasoning ability in auditory domain (Maille and Roeder., 2012; Plotnik et al., 2014). Cats are
273 an ambush-style visual predator. They hide in or behind a natural visual screen (e.g., shrubs,
274 trees, or rocks) and mount surprise attacks on prey (see Turner and Meister, 1988, for a review).
275 This hunting style may be facilitated by formation of a mental representation of the prey from
276 auditory cues. In fact, cats show excellent object permanence, maintaining a representation of
277 the object after its disappearance (Triana and Pasnak, 1981; Dumas, 1992). A cognitive ability to
278 represent an unseen object from its noise is consistent with these ecological needs. As discussed
279 earlier, nonhuman primates use auditory stimuli as a cue to avoid potential predators, rather than
280 for approaching prey (D'Amato and Salmon, 1982). As specialized hunters, cats might be better
281 at inferring something to approach from auditory cues than other species such as nonhuman

282 primates.

283 In Experiment 1, the rattling noise (Contingent noise condition) and white noise (Irrelevant
284 noise condition) were equally effective in attracting cats' attention. This result may be due to the
285 difficulty of adjusting the intensity of the auditory stimuli. Although we adjusted the mean
286 sound level in the two conditions, differences in other aspects such as frequency components
287 might have affected the cats' behavior. In contrast, we used exactly the same auditory stimulus
288 in the two noise conditions in Experiment 2. In the latter experiment cats showed a clear
289 difference in looking behavior between the synchronized noise condition and the
290 unsynchronized noise condition.

291 To our surprise, a minority of the cats explored the container in the response phase. The
292 lack of searching behavior may be due to two possible reasons. One possibility is that cats
293 disliked being restrained for a long time, so that upon being released they went away, rather than
294 explore the apparatus. Although the experiment was conducted in familiar surroundings, the
295 unfamiliar experimental situations might have been mildly stressful for the cats. The other
296 possibility is that although the cats predicted that there was an object inside the container, they
297 were not sufficiently motivated to explore it. Conceivably, more biologically-relevant stimuli,
298 like small prey items, might increase cats' motivation to explore objects detected through sound.
299 Future studies are needed to evaluate these possibilities.

300 It may be asked if differences in shaking movements among conditions could have affected
301 how the cats responded in Experiment 2. The shaking movements in Contingent noise and No
302 noise conditions was rhythmical, whereas in Non-contingent condition they were more random,
303 to make motion and noise unsynchronized. But if the rhythmic motion captured the cats'
304 attention, they should have looked at the container for longer in both Contingent noise and No
305 noise conditions than in Non-contingent noise condition, but this did not occur.

306 How did cats predict the unseen object from the noise? There are at least two possibilities.
307 One is that cats applied a physical rule. The other is that cats had learned the relevant
308 contingency in their daily life before experiment (Penn and Povinelli, 2007; Hill et al., 2012).
309 Sabbatini and Visalberghi (2008) suggested that experience could be a critical factor in this kind
310 of task. They reported that initially only one of eight monkeys tested was able to use auditory
311 stimuli to retrieve hidden food. But after subjects were allowed to directly explore baited and
312 unbaited containers, four of eight monkeys were able to use auditory stimuli. However, we did
313 not aim to determine precisely how cats use noise to predict the presence of non-visible objects;
314 this is a question for future research.

315 Another question for future research concerns exactly what cats represented on the basis of
316 the sounds. They might merely predict the presence of “something,” or they might make a finer
317 distinction, such as a hard object rather than a soft prey item.

Finally, we note that the method used in this study is useful for comparative research. It involves no food reward, so it has two advantages. First, no association learning is likely to occur over the study period (Hill et al., 2012). Second, we can test animals without controlling motivation for food; no food deprivation is needed. A clearer picture of how this simple reasoning ability has evolved may emerge from testing species from a variety of ecological and phylogenetic backgrounds.

Conclusion

The present research investigated whether cats have a causal-logical understanding from sound. Through 2 experiments, we demonstrated that cats predict the existence of an unseen object from shaking movements accompanied by a concomitant sound. Although previous research showed that cats' causal-logical understanding was poor (Whitt et al., 2009), this study provided positive evidence of physical understanding in cats. Further research is needed to investigate more precisely the representational nature of cats' predictions.

Acknowledgement

This study was financially supported by the Grant-in-aide for Scientific Research No. 25240020 to KF from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

336 We wish to thank to all owners and cats who volunteered to participate in this study. We also
337 thank James R. Anderson and Yuya Hataji for his editing of the manuscript.

338

339 **Authorship statement**

340 ST designed this study, conducted experiments, analyzed data, and drafted the
341 manuscript. HC, MA, MT, and AH contributed to data collection. KF provided critical
342 discussion regarding the analyses and the manuscript.

343

344 **Competing interests**

345 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

346

347 **Ethics statement**

348 This study adhered to the ethical guidelines of Kyoto University, and was approved
349 by the Animal Experiments Committee of the Graduate School of Letters of Kyoto
350 University.

351

352

353

354 **Reference**

- 355 Bahrick, L. E. (1987). Infants' intermodal perception of two levels of temporal structure in
356 natural events. *Infant Behav Dev*, **10**, 387-416.
- 357 Bradshaw, J. (2013) *Cat Sense: The Feline Enigma Revealed*, Allen Lane, London.
- 358 Call, J. (2004). Inferences About the Location of Food in the Great Apes (*Pan paniscus*, *Pan*
359 *troglodytes*, *Gorilla gorilla*, and *Pongo pygmaeus*). *J Comp Psychol*, **118**, 232 - 241. (doi:
360 10.1037/0097-7403.32.1.60)
- 361 D'Amato, M. R., & Salmon, D. P. (1982). Tune discrimination in monkeys (*Cebus apella*) and
362 in rats. *Anim Learn Behav*, **10**, 126-134.
- 363 Gosset, D., Fornasieri, I., & Roeder, J. J. (2002). Acoustic structure and contexts of emission of
364 vocal signals by black lemurs. *Evol commun*, **4**, 225-251. (doi: 10.1075/eoc.4.2.06gos)
- 365 Heimbauer, L. A., Antworth, R. L., & Owren, M. J. (2012). Capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*)
366 use positive, but not negative, auditory cues to infer food location. *Anim Cogn*, **15**, 45-55.
367 (doi: 10.1007/s10071-011-0430-5)
- 368 Hill, A., Collier-Baker, E., & Suddendorf, T. (2012). Inferential reasoning by exclusion in
369 children (*Homo sapiens*). *J Comp Psychol*, **126**, 243-254. (doi: 10.1037/a0024449)
- 370 Maille, A., & Roeder, J. J. (2012). Inferences about the location of food in lemurs (*Eulemur*
371 *macaco* and *Eulemur fulvus*): a comparison with apes and monkeys. *Anim Cogn*, **15**,

- 372 1075-1083. (doi: 10.1007/s10071-012-0531-9)
- 373 Paukner, A., Huntsberry, M. E., & Suomi, S. J. (2009). Tufted capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*)
- 374 spontaneously use visual but not acoustic information to find hidden food items. *J Comp*
- 375 *Psychol*, **123**, 26-33. (doi: 10.1037/a0013128)
- 376 Penn, D. C., & Povinelli, D. J. (2007). On the lack of evidence that non-human animals possess
- 377 anything remotely resembling a ‘theory of mind’. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, **362**,
- 378 731-744. (doi: 10.1098/rstb.2006.2023)
- 379 Petit, O., Dufour, V., Herrenschildt, M., De Marco, A., Sterck, E. H., & Call, J. (2015).
- 380 Inferences about food location in three cercopithecine species: an insight into the
- 381 socioecological cognition of primates. *Anim Cogn*, in press. (doi:
- 382 10.1007/s10071-015-0848-2)
- 383 Plotnik, J. M., Shaw, R. C., Brubaker, D. L., Tiller, L. N., & Clayton, N. S. (2014). Thinking
- 384 with their trunks: elephants use smell but not sound to locate food and exclude non
- 385 rewarding alternatives. *Anim Behav*, **88**, 91-98. (doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.11.011)
- 386 Sabbatini, G., & Visalberghi, E. (2008). Inferences about the location of food in capuchin
- 387 monkeys (*Cebus apella*) in two sensory modalities. *J Comp Psychol*, **122**, 156-166. (doi:
- 388 10.1037/0735-7036.122.2.156)
- 389 Schloegl, C., Schmidt, J., Boeckle, M., Weiß, B. M., & Kotrschal, K. (2012). Grey parrots use

- 390 inferential reasoning based on acoustic cues alone. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, **279**,
391 4135-4142. (doi: 10.1098/rspb.2012.1292)
- 392 Schmitt, V., & Fischer, J. (2009). Inferential reasoning and modality dependent discrimination
393 learning in olive baboons (*Papio hamadryas anubis*). *J Comp Psychol*, **123**, 316-325. (doi:
394 10.1037/a0016218)
- 395 Spelke, E. S. (1979). Perceiving bimodally specified events in infancy. *Dev Psychol*, **15**,
396 626-636.
- 397 Spelke, E. S., Born, W. S., & Chu, F. (1983). Perception of moving, sounding objects by
398 four-month-old infants. *Perception*, **12**, 719-732.
- 399 Triana, E., & Pasnak, R. (1981). Object permanence in cats and dogs. *Anim Learn Behav*, **9**,
400 135-139. (doi: 10.3758/BF03212035)
- 401 Turner, D.C., Meister, O., 1988. Hunting behaviour of the domestic cat. In: Turner, D.C.,
402 Bateson, P. (Eds.), *The Domestic Cat: the Biology of its Behaviour*. Cambridge Univ. Press,
403 Cambridge, pp. 111–121.
- 404 Whitt, E., Douglas, M., Osthaus, B., & Hocking, I. (2009). Domestic cats (*Felis catus*) do not
405 show causal understanding in a string-pulling task. *Anim Cogn*, **12**, 739-743. (doi:
406 10.1007/s10071-009-0228-x)
- 407

Figures captions

Figure1 Arrangements of the object and the container in each condition of Experiments 1 and 2.

(a) A block of wood was placed inside the container. It made a rattling noise when the container was shaken. (b) A wireless speaker was attached to the bottom of the container. It played white noise when the container was shaken. (c) Nothing was in the container, which made no sound when shaken. (d) A wireless speaker was attached to the container. It played the rattling noise in synchrony with movement of the container. (e) A wireless speaker attached to the container played the same rattling noise out of synchrony with the shaking movement. (f) Same as (c).


Figure2 Results of Experiment 1.

The mean proportion of frames in which looking occurred (a) in the observation phase, (b) in the response phase, and (c) in both phases pooled. Asterisks indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$). Error bars indicate SEs.

Figure3 Results of Experiment 2.

The mean proportion of frames in which looking occurred (a) in the observation phase and (b) in the response phase, and (c) in both phases pooled. Asterisks indicate a significant difference ($*p < .05$, $**p < .01$). Error bars indicate SEs.

Fig. 1






Fig. 2




Fig. 3